1858 The Daily Colonist. 1959

"An Independent Newspaper, The Organ of No Clique or Party"

SETH HALTON, Publisher — SANDHAM GRAVES, Editor-in-Chief

Published every morning except Monday by the Colonist Publishers Ltd. at 2631 Douglas Street, Victoria, B.C.

SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1959

Upset for Red China

THE safe arrival of the Dalai Lama in India, where he has been granted asylum, leaves the Red Chinese with a much bigger problem on their hands than the "pacification" of an angry Tibet. Throughout many lands in the Middle East and Far East the senior Lama is regarded as the spiritual head of the Buddhist order, a sacred figure within the circles of that faith. With the Pachen Lama already in their power, the drive of the Red Chinese to suborn or physically to detain the Dalai Lama on the threadbare excuse of tribal revolt in Tibet has failed under circumstances visible to the world.

The "pacification" of Tibet appears to be proceeding, with the use of heavy cannon against the tribesmen who shielded the withdrawal of their spiritual leader through the hills and across the Indian frontier. There is no doubt that by this and other means of oppression the revolt against Red Chinese domination of the small country will be brought to a halt. Its brutal suppression, however, will not make friends for the Red Chinese over the vast subcontinent where the Buddhist faith has been followed for thousands of years; while in the hills of Tibet tribesmen will fight on against the invaders for a long time to come.

Apart entirely from the rights and wrongs of the outbreak in Tibet—and what "rights" can the Red Chinese show for their invasion of the little land in the first instance?—Peiping's leaders have made a colossal blunder on the political front by their life-or-death pursuit of the Dalai Lama. That he is free now and in safe hands not only emphasizes their failure, but also ensures that Tibetan resistance to Red Chinese rule will be carried on both within and outside of the country. Among Western lands meanwhile Red China will be farther from any possible admission to the United Nations than before.

Seeing the Queen

THE deputy provincial secretary says that royal visit plans for Victoria and the Island are intended to allow a good look at the Queen. "It is not fair to whizz her past," says Mr. Wallace, "and we will not do it." That at least is one comforting assurance. When Princess Margaret was here last year she certainly was "whisked," and at a speed that made the long preliminary wait not worth while for many people.

Mr. Wallace made such a success of the B.C. centennial planning he can be trusted to show proper concern for the public's share of a royal visit. Too often this has seemed of secondary importance. The proclaimed theme of the Queen's visit to Canada this time is to "meet the people." Obviously this cannot mean that everyone can greet her personally, but as many persons as possible should be given the opportunity to see her at fairly close range.

Not much more will be feasible in Victoria in any case. Her Majesty will be here only two nights and one day, and so even the necessary official ceremonies must be kept to a minimum. It is the daytime passage of the Queen that involves the public, and drives in and around the Greater Victoria area presumably will be given some priority. Eight-mile-an-hour slowdown zones have been mentioned, but this rate of progress might well be cut to four-miles-an-hour to give spectators a decent chance to see the royal visitors.

A vantage point of some kind is envisaged for Scouts, Guides, and other young age groups, and one would like to see this carried out by packing Royal Athletic Park with youngsters. Similar events elsewhere of this nature with the Queen driving round to greet the children have been a great success. The fact that July is a school vacation period should be no obstacle. Let the park be thrown open for these young people and for them alone. In the past they have been those suffering most disappointment at not seeing their Queen.

Freedom Not To Print

A GOOD deal of misunderstanding appears to exist — sometimes among people who should know better — as to the meaning of "freedom of the press" with respect to letters addressed to the editor of a newspaper. Most daily papers and many of the magazines make space available for expressions of their readers' views on current topics.

Access to that section of the paper is a privilege extended freely; neither the editor nor the proprietors are under any obligation to turn their columns into a vehicle for the unsolicited opinions of others. But within certain necessary limitations they do it as an act of courtesy and also in the belief that a newspaper should as a public service and within reason assist in a free discussion of problems and events of the day.

There is, however, a deep gulf between privilege and right, and many of those who try to get letters into the press either fail or refuse to see it. It is by no means uncommon for a letter to the editor to be accompanied by a note "demanding" that it be published, in full, in the name of freedom of the press. If for some reason it is deemed unsuitable for publication (and the reason is rarely the one assumed by the writer of the letter) it may be followed up with a sneering comment containing such exclamations as "So much for freedom of the press!"

To those people it should be pointed out that freedom of the press includes freedom not to print as well as to print. No man has any color of right to space in a publication printed by someone else, any more than he has the right to display his wares in someone else's show window. What he has, subject to the laws respecting treason and libel, is the right to print and publish his opinions, but he may not demand that a newspaper publish them for him.

This is not to say that space for readers' letters is given grudgingly or withheld because they express views contrary to those of the newspaper itself. The opposite is the case, as regular readers of the "letters" columns must agree. This paper for one has printed innumerable letters severely taking it to task for this or that, because it is always a reader's privilege to disagree. There are several reasons for the rejection or abridging of letters, but all of them we believe to be fair and in conformity with accepted concepts of freedom of the press.

Interpreting the News

Middle East Is Upset

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Editor

ASIAN and Mid-Eastern neutrals are having second thoughts about Communism.

And other nations in the same area, having long since declared themselves against Communism, are redoubling efforts to stamp it out within their own borders.

The second thoughts are the direct results of Red China's ruthless attempts to stamp out the revolt in Tibet, and have been especially evident in India and Indonesia, two states where Khrushchev and Mao Tse Tung have had their most vocal apologists.

The situation is especially distressing for Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, of India.

It took many weeks for Nehru finally to condemn Soviet Russia for its suppression of the Hungarian revolt. When at last he did take a stand, he explained:

"I had to unlearn all I had learned before I could learn the right lesson."

Nehru, a socialist and an idealist, was learning the hard way. The present lesson comes no easier.

But hesitant and mild though his condemnation may be, Nehru also is recognizing Red China's threat to Asia in general and to India specifically. It may come none too soon.

Nehru's All-India Congress Party was not able to prevent a Communist regime from taking over the Indian state of Kerala, with all its attendant loss of freedoms. Red Chinese maps have appeared in India incorporating within Red China Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, particular spheres of Indian influence.

Nehru's opposition is demanding to know what further evidence he needs of Red China's expansion plans.

It was at the Bandung conference in Indonesia in 1955 that Red China blossomed out as the defender of Asia against Western colonialism and against Western interference in Asian affairs.

It was a high-water mark of Red Chinese prestige. Today, under the hammer blows against Tibet, that prestige is vanishing rapidly.

Said the influential Times of Indonesia: "Forced conversion to Communism at the point of the bayonet will not go down well in the neutral countries which are China's mainstay in international politics."

"— And in the next performance, I will negotiate while drinking a glass of water

Standing Room Only

Overcrowded World

AS a species, man is a latecomer but a phenomenal success. He has triumphed over all other animals, subdued many of the diseases that attack him, found ingenious ways to wrest his sustenance from the earth's crust—and multiplied.

In a relatively short span of time man has increased his population to a peak of some 2,790,000,000, the National Geographic Society says. In 1959 and 1960, according to a recent estimate, another 100,000,000 human beings will arrive. And therein lies a problem.

"Explosion" is the word used by demographers, or population analysts, to describe the upsurge. It took about 200,000 years for the species to number 2,000,000 at mid-20th century. Now it seems inevitable that the 4,000,000,000-mark will be reached in merely 30 years.

* * *

The rampant rise is due not to higher birth rates but to a fantastic decline in death rates, especially in poor countries already teeming with people. Modern medical science is helping the rich and poor alike to stave off disease, disability and early death.

If population grows at the recent explosive rate, the world will have 6,000,000,000 mouths to feed by AD 2000. This hypothesis is made nightmarish by the fact that even today very few people in the world will ever feast upon what North Americans consider an ordinary square meal.

"With the present rate of increase," states a United Nations report on population, "it can be calculated that in 600 years the number of human beings on earth will be such that there will be only one square metre (1.2 square yards) for each to live on. It goes without saying that this can never take place, something will happen to prevent it."

What will happen is a matter of speculation. The gloomy sociologist Malthus, in his pioneering population study of 1798, maintained that war, pestilence, and disease were needed to check the human race. In the present situation no such macabre prospects are offered. Hopefully, the 15-nation UN Population Commission is concentrating on the dilemma, and making the public starkly aware of the peril.

The world's major physical resources already have been brought into use. And the giant hand of industry is digging deeper and deeper into known supplies of water, fuel, minerals, and other basic materials. Water shortages, in particular, are a world-wide problem.

Pessimistic demographers fear that man will multiply himself into universal poverty. The optimistic believe that production can keep pace with need: new sources of power to replace fossil fuels; new raw materials for industry; new techniques of agriculture and processing to provide more food.

* * *

By present standards relatively few people were living in Christ's time: in all, perhaps 250,000,000. That is the present population of North America alone.

Like death and taxes, however, the population problem has haunted mankind since antiquity. Citizens of countless states have feared becoming too numerous to exist on the food available, too few to protect themselves. Plato's Greece was threatened with overpopulation; several centuries later it was fretting about underpopulation. European countries were seriously concerned, after the First World War, with the decline in births.

Gerald Waring

Reports from Ottawa

ONE of the least known, least sought after and most infrequently bestowed honors in the gift of a prime minister is a state funeral.

The lack of enthusiasm for such reward compared, say, with a senatorship is at least understandable. People prefer their honors, recognition, reward or what have you when they can enjoy them, not later.

Yet a state funeral is a genuine honor, and carries with it a not inconsiderable financial benefit for the honored individual's family. The government pays all the expenses—casket, undertaker, minister, and transportation. This can run up to $10,000 as in the case of Mackenzie King's elaborate funeral, and the $9,700 paid for the funeral of the great French-Canadian Liberal leader and justice minister, Ernest Lapointe.

Technically, I suppose, the tax collectors could come on the estate of a deceased cabinet minister for tax due on the amount the government as his employer chose to spend on his funeral. I do not know that the collectors have ever been so assiduous.

* * *

While cabinet ministers who die in office are entitled by custom to state funerals, it is a decision for the family as to whether the honor shall be accepted. The wishes of the family are paramount. For example, the offer may be accepted with a condition that the ultimate in formality be omitted: the lying in state in the marble-colonnaded Hall of Fame in the Parliament Building where have rested, in my time, the biers of Mackenzie King and former Labor Minister Humphrey Mitchell.

Privy councillors other than cabinet ministers also have had state funerals—at least two former ministers having been so honored in full knowledge of their financial difficulties. Presumably that was the reason.

Governors-general, too, rank state funerals—as Lord Tweedsmuir. No doubt the honor will be extended to former governors-general resident in Canada when the occasion arises.

* * *

Despite general appreciation of what is flippantly called the high cost of dying, up to $10,000 for a state funeral may seem a trifle exorbitant. But for a customer with wallet as well stuffed as the government's, the undertaker trots out his best solid walnut and bronze, not his economy birch veneer and aluminum. And often a special train is required, or, as in a recent funeral, two special aircraft.

Ordinary members of Parliament do not rate state funerals. Their recognition is in eulogies at the next sitting of the House of which they are members, and the flying of the flag on the Peace Tower at half staff from the day of death through the day of funeral.

There being 467 members of the Commons and the Senate, it has happened that the flag has been at half staff for as long as a fortnight at a time. For one senator who died in Florida it flew a full week, while he was being brought home for burial.

This situation has given rise to criticism that we might be more appreciative of our parliamentarians during their lifetimes, and limit the flag-dropping to the day of burial, as is the custom in Britain.

The Packsack

Of GREGORY CLARK

RIGHT now is a time of terror for nearly all the mammalian world save us and our pets and slaves, the cow, horse, hog and sheep. Here we sit, warm and cosy, expecting the spring.

But in the wilds all our kindred, lean and weary from the long winter, face the tragic days of spring.

The ice is perishing. In ragged blocks it begins to rear and plunge down little rivers. And in the big rivers it goes insane, thundering like wild horses, making dams, bursting dams, flooding, tearing, crushing.

The sky is ravenous with wind. No more silent snow, the rain lashes and curves around every shelter, into every crevice. The old trees fall. The dead branches hurl down. The sleet bites.

All the females of the deer, the fox, wolf, beaver, are heavy with their young. It is hard to be quick.

Of all the weeks of the year, this is the most perilous for a million million bearers of the mysterious torch we call life.

Would it be, perhaps, childish of us to offer a small prayer for them?

How About Nickel Coffee?

(From The Portland Oregonian)

COFFEE prices have reached the lowest level in nearly 10 years, as a result of the latest round of cuts. In 23 months, says the Associated Press, Coffee has been reduced by 30 cents a pound.

The homemaker is well aware of this reversal in the general upward march of food prices. It makes considerable differences in the grocery bill of a household which uses a couple of pounds of coffee each week. The women who fumed and reduced coffee purchases when prices shot far above $1 a pound should be happy now, though the coffee countries of South and Central America, of course, are not.

Those who drink coffee in public places have not noticed any effect of the price cuts, however. Restaurants were quick to raise their prices to 10 and 15 cents a cup, when the cost of raw materials was shooting skyward. But any recent reductions have been so few as to be unnoticeable. A good 5-cent cup of coffee should be in the cards again. At least a restaurant should be able to serve coffee with a meal without charging a dime extra for it.

With the Classics

Bees sip not at one flower,
Spring comes not with one
shower,
Nor shines the sun alone
Upon one favored hour,
But with unstinted power
Makes every day his own.

—JOHN CLARE.

Washington Angle

Futile Journey

By DAVID LAWRENCE

THREE years and three months isn't a long time in world affairs, yet how many people who are so enthusiastically hailing the next summit conference remember that the Soviet government made a solemn pledge three years ago at a summit conference and then broke it four months later at a foreign ministers' conference?

Of what avail is any summit conference if the agreements are later torn into scraps of paper?

A certain communique, for instance, is worth rereading today. The head of the Soviet government—Bulganin—with Khrushchev at his side, signed it on July 23, 1955. It was issued after a summit conference at Geneva, attended also by President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden and Premier Faure of France. The statement said:

"The heads of government recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security. The foreign ministers will make whatever arrangements they may consider desirable for the participation of, or for consultation with, other interested parties."

* * *

This was a "directive" or formal instruction to the foreign ministers of the same four countries—the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and the United States. The four ministers then met at Geneva, and here is the text of the joint declaration of France, Great Britain and the United States, issued at the close of the conference on Nov. 16, 1955:

"At Geneva, the foreign ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America tried to reach agreement with the Soviet foreign minister on what the four heads of government in July agreed were the closely linked problems of German reunification and European security. To this end, they made a proposal for the reunification of Germany by free elections in 1956 and for a treaty of assurance giving the Soviet Union far-reaching safeguards against aggression when Germany was reunified.

"Marshal Bulganin in July had agreed that the reunification of Germany was the common responsibility of the four powers and should be carried out by means of free elections. The Soviet foreign minister, however, despite the directive of the heads of government, made it plain that the Soviet government refused to agree to the reunification of Germany, since that would lead to the liquidation of the East German regime. He made counter-proposals which would have involved the continued division of Germany as well as the eventual dissolution of the Western security system. It is for this reason that the negotiations have failed.

* * *

"The foreign ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are aware that this result must bring a sense of cruel disappointment to the German people, east and west of the zonal border which now unjustly divides them. However, the three foreign ministers believe that the Soviet government will come to recognize that its own self-interest will be served by ending the injustice of a divided Germany. They believe that the Soviet government will realize that so long as it persists in withholding unity from the German people, there can be no solid security in Europe, nor, indeed, in the world.

"The three Western powers will themselves not cease their efforts to end the injustice and wrong now being done by dividing the German people and will continue to stand ready to contribute to the security which can be enjoyed by all only when Germany is reunified."

Why does the Soviet Union think now it can reap the fruits of its repudiation of the pledge given at the summit conference of July, 1955, and gain its ends in 1959?

Perhaps it is because the Soviets have an iron determination and believe that the Western democracies are undergoing a process of moral deterioration in which principle will be sacrificed for expediency.

Fun, Fact and Fiction

The Parisian designers have promised that women will look like women from now on, which is welcome news to those men who have wearied of just getting along on their memories.

* * *

Television's quiz-program planners are discovering that honesty is the best policy, even if you can't build a very lively show around it.